

NOV 30 2005

**TOLER
LARSON
& ABEL****FACSIMILE COVER SHEET****DATE:** 11/30/2005**TO:** Examiner WONG, Allen C. **FAX NO.:** 571-273-8300
USPTO GPAU 2613**FROM:** Ryan S. Davidson
Reg. No.: 51,596**RE U.S. App. No.:** 09/990,976, filed 11/21/2001**Applicant(s):** Indra Laksono**Atty Dkt No.:** VIXS.0100120 (1459-VIXS012)**Title:** SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR MULTIPLE CHANNEL VIDEO
TRANSCODING**NO. OF PAGES (including Cover Sheet):** 8**MESSAGE:**

Attached please find:

- ☒ Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review (1 pg)
- ☒ Notice of Appeal (1 pg)
- ☒ Remarks in Support of the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review (5 pgs)

5000 Plaza On The Lake
Suite 265
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78746Tel: (512) 327-5515
Fax: (512) 327-5452**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE**

The pages accompanying this facsimile transmission contain information from the law office of Toler, Larson & Abel, L.L.P. and are confidential and privileged. The information is intended to be used by the individual(s) or entity(ies) named on this cover sheet only. If you are not the intended recipient be aware that reading disclosing copying distribution or use of the contents of this transmission is prohibited. Please notify us immediately if you have received this transmission in error at the number listed above and return the document to us via regular mail.

NOV 30 2005

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-06)

Approved for use through xxhxx/200x. OMB 0651-000x
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW | | Docket Number (Optional) VIXS.0100120 (1459-VIXS012) | |
| I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on <u>11/30/05</u> Signature <u>[Signature]</u> Typed or printed name <u>Judy Carey</u> | | Application Number 09/990,976 Filed 11/21/2001 First Named Inventor Indra LAKSONO Art Unit 2613 Examiner WONG, Allen C. | |
| Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided. | | | |
| I am the <input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor. <input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96) <input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 <u>51,596</u> | | <u>[Signature]</u> Signature Ryan S. Davidson Typed or printed name (512) 327-5515 Telephone number <u>30 November 2005</u> Date | |
| NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*. | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> *Total of _____ forms are submitted. | | | |

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

PATENT

NOV 30 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Indra LAKSONO

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR MULTIPLE CHANNEL VIDEO
TRANSCODING

App. No.: 09/990,976

Filed: 11/21/2001

Examiner: WONG, Allen C.

Group Art Unit: 2613

Customer No.: 29331

Confirmation No.: 4211

Atty. Dkt. No.: VIXS.0100120
(1459-VIXS012)

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REMARKS IN SUPPORT OF
THE PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed September 2, 2004, the Final Office Action mailed May 9, 2005 (hereinafter, "the First Final Action"), the Final Office Action mailed August 1, 2005 (hereinafter, "the Second Final Action"), and the Advisory Action mailed October 31, 2005, and pursuant to the Notice of Appeal and Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review submitted herewith, the Applicant requests review of the following issues on appeal.

The proposed combination of Keith and Youn fails to disclose or suggest accessing a first plurality of macroblock information in a first order based on a first index table as recited by claim 1

Independent claim 1 recites the features of *accessing* a first plurality of macroblock information *in a first order* at a video decoder to generate a first decoded image, *wherein the first order is based upon a first index table*. As described at pages 8-11 of the Response filed October 3, 2005 (hereinafter, "the Previous Response"), Keith (U.S. Patent No. 5,493,514) and Youn

PATENT

(U.S. Patent No. 6,466,623) fail to disclose or suggest, individually or in combination, at least these claimed features.

Specifically, as discussed in the Previous Response, Keith describes a technique to parse an “encoded bitstream into individual variable-length signals and mapping the variable-length signals into their corresponding codebook values” whereby the lookup table of Keith “maps the possible bit pointer values to the values to be added to the byte pointer.” *Keith*, col. 42, line 55 – col. 43, line 20. However, the lookup table of Keith does not define the order in which macroblock information is accessed because, as acknowledged by the Second Final Action, the bitstream of Keith is processed bit-by-bit in sequence. Keith fails to disclose or suggest that the order in which the bits of the bitstream are processed is dependent on, influenced by, or otherwise based on the lookup table of Keith. Rather, the lookup table of Keith is used simply to parse the bitstream into variable length signals by keeping track of the bit position and, because Keith teaches that the bitstream is accessed only in a predetermined order (i.e., bit-by-bit sequentially) that is not based on the lookup table of Keith in any manner, Keith necessarily fails to disclose or suggest the features of accessing a first plurality of macroblock information in a first order, wherein the first order is based on an index table as recited by claim 1.

The Advisory Action responds by asserting that:

Keith's col. 42, ln. 11-23 asserts that the bit is read or accessed one at a time within the bitstream via a bit pointer, and then, the bit of the bitstream is processed one at a time or in any orderly manner, i.e., a first order. Thus, orders are predetermined. Keith's col. 42, ln. 66 to col. 43, ln. 15 states the processing of the bit in the bitstream is done by utilizing the bit pointer values based on the lookup table, where the bit pointer is updated in an orderly manner. Keith discloses video decoding the information from the lookup table that stores data pertaining to macroblock data like quantization level and motion vector data in the first order. Thus, Keith discloses or suggests that the lookup table determines the order in which data from the bitstream is accessed.

Advisory Action, p. 2 (emphasis added).

As acknowledged by the Office, Keith discloses that the each bit of the bitstream “is accessed one at a time within the bitstream via a bit pointer, and then, the bit of the bitstream is processed one at a time or in an orderly manner.” *Id.* Thus, as noted above and as discussed in the Previous Response, Keith teaches that each bit is accessed and processed in the sequence that it occurs in the bitstream, i.e., Keith teaches a fixed bit processing sequence (i.e., in sequential

PATENT

order) that is in no way based on the lookup table of Keith. One of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate that a change to the values of the lookup table of Keith would not change the order in which the data represented by the bitstream is processed, but rather would merely result in a change in the bit locations where the bitstream is parsed into bytes. Thus, because a change in the lookup table of Keith has no effect on the order in which the bits of the bitstream is processed, the lookup table of Keith would have no effect on the order in which a plurality of macroblock information is processed assuming the bitstream represented macroblock information. Accordingly, the Office fails to establish that Keith discloses or suggests features of *accessing a first plurality of macroblock information in a first order at a video decoder to generate a first decoded image, wherein the first order is based upon a first index table*. The Office therefore fails to establish that the proposed combination of Keith and Youn discloses or suggests each and every feature recited by claim 1.

The proposed combination of Keith and Youn fails to disclose or suggest an index table generator coupled to receive a size indicator of a destination image and to generate an index table identifying a first portion of the plurality of source macroblock information to be used to generate a first destination source vector, the index table based upon the size indicator of the destination image as recited by claim 22

Independent claim 22 recites the features of an index table generator coupled to *receive a size indicator of a destination image and to generate an index table identifying a first portion of the plurality of source macroblock information to be used to generate a first destination source vector, the index table based upon the size indicator of the destination image*. As discussed at pages 12 and 13 of the Previous Response, Keith and Youn fail to disclose or suggest, individually or in combination, at least these features. Specifically, as noted in the Previous Response, the lookup table of Keith is used merely to parse an encoded bitstream into variable-length signals using bit and byte pointers represented by the lookup table and Keith does not disclose or suggest that the lookup table identifies a first portion of a plurality of source macroblock information to be used to generate a first destination source vector as recited by claim 22 in any manner. Moreover, with reference to the "ImageSize," "ImageXSize" and "ImageYSize" values cited by the First and Second Final Actions and the Advisory Action, Keith does not disclose or suggest that the lookup table is based on these values in any manner and Keith therefore fails to disclose or suggest an index table based on a size indicator of a destination image as recited by claim 22 in any manner.

PATENT

The Advisory Action responds by stating that

in Keith's col. 42, ln. 66 to col. 43, ln. 15, the lookup table is accessed or indexed to store information, via index pointer, relating to identify a certain portion of plural macroblock data, and that the image size is accounted for as shown in fig. 15. Keith's fig. 15 asserts the "ImageSize", as well as the image's dimensions, "ImageXSize" and "ImageYSize" can be accessed or indexed depending on the bit data of the bitstream. Thus, Keith discloses or suggests generating an index table identifying a first portion of source macroblock information to be used to generate a first destination source vector, and limitations such as an index table is based upon a size indicator or a destination image.

Advisory Action, p. 2.

However, contrary to the assertions of the Advisory Action, and as previously discussed in the Previous Response, Keith fails to disclose or suggest that the index table of Keith is generated based on the alleged size indicators "ImageSize," "ImageX Size," and "ImageYSize" in any manner. Accordingly, Keith necessarily fails to disclose or suggest the features of an index table generator coupled to *receive a size indicator of a destination image* and to generate an index table *identifying a first portion of the plurality of source macroblock information to be used to generate a first destination source vector, the index table based upon the size indicator of the destination image* as recited by claim 22. Accordingly, the proposed combination of Keith and Youn fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by independent claim 22.

The proposed combination of Keith and Chen fails to disclose or suggest determining an index table having a plurality of entries, the index table based upon a video source resolution and a video destination resolution, wherein a location of each source macroblock information for each macroblock is referenced by a corresponding entry of the index table as recited by independent claim 14

Independent claim 14 recites the features of determining an index table having a plurality of entries, the index table *based upon a video source resolution and a video destination resolution*, wherein *a location of each source macroblock information* for each macroblock is *referenced by a corresponding entry of the index table*. As described at pages 13 and 14 of the Previous Response, the proposed combination of Keith and Chen (U.S. Patent No. 6,259,741) fails to disclose or suggest these claimed features. Specifically, it was noted that the lookup table of Keith is used only to parse an encoded bitstream into variable-length signals using bit and byte pointers and the lookup table of Keith does not include entries that reference a location of each source macroblock information as provided by claim 14. Moreover, as discussed above with respect to claim 22, Keith does not disclose or suggest that the lookup table of Keith is based on

PATENT

image size or resolution in any manner, so Keith necessarily fails to disclose or suggest the features of wherein the index table is *based upon a video source resolution and a video destination resolution* as recited by claim 14.

The Advisory Action responds by stating

Keith's col. 42, ln. 11-23 and col. 42, ln. 66 to col. 43, ln. 15, Keith suggests the lookup table or index table that stores data or entries belonging to macroblock data, ie. quantization level or locations of source macroblock information and motion vector data. Thus, Keith discloses or suggests the index table having entries corresponding to the locations of source macroblock information.

Advisory Action, p. 2.


Contrary to the Office's assertions, the index table of Keith does not "store data or entries belonging to the macroblock data." Rather, as noted above and in the Previous Response, Keith discloses that the index table is used solely for maintaining bit and byte pointers for the purposes of parsing the incoming bitstream into bytes. Keith fails to disclose or suggest that a location of each source macroblock information is referenced by a corresponding entry of the index table of Keith. Accordingly, Keith fails to disclose or even suggest the claimed features of an index table having a plurality of entries, wherein *a location of each source macroblock information for each macroblock is referenced by a corresponding entry of the index table*. Accordingly, the Office fails to establish that the proposed combination of Keith and Chen discloses or suggests each and every feature recited by claim 14.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the Office fails to establish that the proposed combinations of the cited references disclose or suggest each and every element recited by any of the pending claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

30 November 2005
Date


Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone) (512) 327-5452 (fax)